

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Dan Galai et al. Art Unit : 3624
Serial No. : 10/753,131 Examiner : Lalita M. Hamilton
Filed : January 7, 2004 Conf. No. : 4435
Title : DIVERSIFICATION OF RISK FOR ARTISTS AND INVESTORS

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY TO ACTION OF JULY 6, 2006

Applicant submits the following remarks in response to the action of July 6, 2006.

Summary of telephone conferences with the Examiner

Applicant's attorney thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of the telephonic interview on or about July 25, 2006, and the subsequent telephone conversations.

During the telephone interview of July 25, applicant's attorney and the Examiner discussed the subject matter of the pending independent claims and the references cited against those claims (*i.e.*, the Camelio and Andrus published patent applications). The distinctions between the claimed subject matter and the cited references, including the non-obviousness of the claimed subject matter, was discussed based on the arguments previously set forth at pages 6-10 of applicant's appeal brief. Applicant's attorney also drew the attention of the Examiner to the objective evidence of non-obviousness discussed at pages 10-12 of the appeal brief and offered to provide additional such evidence if that would be helpful.